

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

PCT

INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44*bis*)

Applicant's or agent's file reference Sche/V/9/03	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below
International application No. PCT/EP2004/014656	International filing date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 23 December 2004 (23.12.2004)	Priority date (<i>day/month/year</i>) 24 December 2003 (24.12.2003)
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237		
Applicant SCHWARZ PHARMA AG		

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .1(a).																								
2.	This REPORT consists of a total of 6 sheets, including this cover sheet. In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.																								
3.	<p>This report contains indications relating to the following items:</p> <table style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 10%; text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td style="width: 30%;">Box No. I</td> <td style="width: 80%;">Basis of the report</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. II</td> <td>Priority</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. III</td> <td>Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. IV</td> <td>Lack of unity of invention</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. V</td> <td>Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VI</td> <td>Certain documents cited</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VII</td> <td>Certain defects in the international application</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;"><input type="checkbox"/></td> <td>Box No. VIII</td> <td>Certain observations on the international application</td> </tr> </table>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application	<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the report																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention																							
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application																							
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application																							
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44 <i>bis</i> .3(c) and 93 <i>bis</i> .1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44 <i>bis</i> .2).																								

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Date of issuance of this report 29 August 2006 (29.08.2006)
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	Authorized officer <div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold; margin: 10px 0;">Agnes Wittmann-Regis</div> e-mail: pt06@wipo.int

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

TRANSLATION

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:

Date of mailing (day/month/year) **See Form PCT/ISA/210 (sheet 2)**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

Sche/v/9/03

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014656

International filing date (day/month/year)

23.12.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)

24.12.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

A61K31/381 , A61P25/16

Applicant

SCHWARZ PHARMA AG

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. I | Basis of the opinion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. II | Priority |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. III | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. IV | Lack of unity of invention |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Box No. V | Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VI | Certain documents cited |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VII | Certain defects in the international application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application |

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014656

Box No. I Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.

☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language
_____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014656

Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

The questions whether the claimed invention appears to be novel, to involve an inventive step (to be non obvious), or to be industrially applicable have not been examined in respect of:

☐ the entire international application

☒ claims Nos. 1-18 (gA)

because:

☒ the said international application, or the said claims Nos. _____
relate to the following subject matter which does not require an international preliminary examination (*specify*):

Claims 1-18 relate to subject matter which, in the opinion of this Authority, falls under PCT Rule 67.1(iv). Consequently, no expert opinion has been established in respect of the industrial applicability of the subject matter of said claims (PCT Article 34(4)(a)(i)).

☐ the description, claims or drawings (*indicate particular elements below*) or said claims Nos. _____
are so unclear that no meaningful opinion could be formed (*specify*):

☐ the claims, or said claims Nos. _____ are so inadequately supported by the description that no meaningful opinion could be formed.

☐ no international search report has been established for said claims Nos. _____

☐ the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing does not comply with the standard provided for in Annex C of the Administrative Instructions in that:

the written form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

the computer readable form

☐ has not been furnished

☐ does not comply with the standard

☐ the tables related to the nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence listing, if in computer readable form only, do not comply with the technical requirements provided for in Annex C-bis of the Administrative Instructions.

☐ See Supplemental Box for further details.

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014656

Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement																								
1. Statement	<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"><tr><td style="width: 30%; vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;">Novelty (N)</td><td style="width: 5%;"></td><td style="width: 40%; padding: 5px;">Claims <u>1-20</u></td><td style="width: 25%; padding: 5px;">YES</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td style="padding: 5px;">Claims _____</td><td style="padding: 5px;">NO</td></tr><tr><td style="vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;">Inventive step (IS)</td><td></td><td style="padding: 5px;">Claims <u>1-20</u></td><td style="padding: 5px;">YES</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td style="padding: 5px;">Claims _____</td><td style="padding: 5px;">NO</td></tr><tr><td style="vertical-align: top; padding: 5px;">Industrial applicability (IA)</td><td></td><td style="padding: 5px;">Claims <u>1-20</u></td><td style="padding: 5px;">YES</td></tr><tr><td></td><td></td><td style="padding: 5px;">Claims _____</td><td style="padding: 5px;">NO</td></tr></table>	Novelty (N)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES			Claims _____	NO	Inventive step (IS)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES			Claims _____	NO	Industrial applicability (IA)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES			Claims _____	NO
Novelty (N)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES																						
		Claims _____	NO																						
Inventive step (IS)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES																						
		Claims _____	NO																						
Industrial applicability (IA)		Claims <u>1-20</u>	YES																						
		Claims _____	NO																						
2. Citations and explanations:	<p>1. Reference is made to the following document: D1: WO 02/089777</p> <p>Document D1 is considered the closest prior art for the subject matter of claim 1. It discloses the use of compounds of the formula I (including Rotigotin) for treatment of Parkinson's patients. The subject matter of claim 1 differs from this in that the compounds are used for <u>preventative</u> treatment of Parkinson's disease.</p> <p>The subject matter of claim 1 is therefore novel (PCT Article 33(2)).</p> <p>The problem addressed by the present invention can therefore be considered that of preventing the disease (Parkinson's disease).</p> <p>Since D1 contains no suggestion that the compounds are also suitable for preventative purposes, the subject matter of claim 1 meets the PCT requirements for inventive step.</p>																								

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/EP2004/014656

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

Claims 2-18 are dependent on claim 1 and thus also meet the PCT requirements for novelty and inventive step.

For the reasons set out above, the subject matters of claims 19 and 20 are likewise novel and inventive.

2. The PCT Contracting States do not have uniform criteria for assessing the industrial applicability of claims 1-18 in their present form. Patentability may also depend on the wording of the claims. The EPO, for example, does not recognize the industrial applicability of claims to medical use of a compound; it may, however, allow claims to the first medical application of a known compound or to the use of such a compound in the manufacture of a drug for a new medical application.